UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/676,260	10/02/2003	Hyung-seok Kang	912-41	3476
23117 7590 06/07/2007 NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC 901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR			EXAMINER	
			KISHORE, GOLLAMUDI S	
ARLINGTON	, VA 22203		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1615	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
•			06/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
		10/676,260	KANG ET AL.		
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit		
	·	Gollamudi S. Kishore, Ph.D	1615		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SH WHI(- Exte after - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAnsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status	·		•		
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 Ag	oril 2007.			
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.		
Disposit	ion of Claims				
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.			
Applicat	ion Papers				
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examiner	r.			
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	•	·		
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex-		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priorical application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage		
Attachmen	nt(s)				
1) Notic	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary			
3) 🔲 Infon	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:			

DETAILED ACTION

The amendment dated 4-17-07 is acknowledged.

Claims included in the prosecution are 1-17.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

According to claim 1, the formulation is a submicron liposome. However, claim 12 recites the higher range as 10 micrometer which is inconsistent with the term, 'submicron'.

Applicant's argument that the terminology employed is appropriate and consistent with current understanding and practice is not persuasive since it is not followed with any evidence.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touitou (5,716,638) by itself or in combination Cauwenbergh (5,476,853).

Touitou discloses a method of preparation of liposomes containing active agents which includes terpenes. The method involves adding the lipophilic drug and Phospholipon in ethanol-propylene glycol either at room temperature or at 60 to 70 degrees, adding to distilled water and TEA (triethanolamine) and cooling the mixture (abstract; col. 1, lines 8-32; col. 1, line 66 through col. 3, line 10; col. 4, lines 14-50; columns 5 and 6 and claims). Instant method differs from Touitou in the following way. In instant method the terpenoid is dispersed in polyol (propylene glycol) at 60-70 degrees to which TEA is added and then phospholipid solution in ethanol is added. To this mixture, water is then added. In Touitou, the lipophilic drug, phospholipid are added together in ethanol-propylene glycol mixture to which the TEA and water is added. Since the function of the base is to elevate the pH of a dispersion to alkaline values and since the addition of water to the phospholipid in the organic solvent in both Touitou and instant method, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to vary the steps in the method of Touitou and still expect the formation of the liposomes. Touitou also differs from instant method in the last step; that is, the addition of the acid to change the alkaline pH of the liposomal suspension. However, since the preparations of Touitou are meant for the topical application of skin, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to change the alkaline pH resulting from the addition of TEA in Touitou to neutral or near neutral pH by the addition of an acid since these pH levels are compatible with skin. One of ordinary skill

in the art would be motivated to change the alkaline pH of Touitou to pH of 5 to 7.5 since the reference of Cauwenbergh while disclosing liposomal skin formulations such as toilet waters and skin milk teaches that the final pH of 5 to 7.5 is preferable and this pH can be obtained by the addition of either a base or an acid or buffer such as citric acid or phosphoric acid or acetate buffer (abstract; col. 3, lines 37-65; Examples 4 and 5). Although Touitou does not teach specifically triterpenoids and claimed triterpenoids. since he teaches generic 'terpenes', it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use any terpene including claimed triterpenes since these are also lipophilic with a reasonable expectation of success.

Page 4

5. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touitou (5,716,638) by itself or in combination Cauwenbergh (5,476,853) in further combination with Delrieu (5,962,015).

The teachings of Touitou and Cauwenbergh have been discussed above.

Delrieu while disclosing stabilized liposome formulations teaches that compounds such as triethanolamine, a common cosmetic buffer, can be added to phospholipid starting materials during the preparation of the liposomes to prevent aggregation and provide some stability (abstract, col. 2, lines 2-5). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art to add TEA after instant step A with a reasonable expectation of success since Delrieu teaches that TEA can be added at any state of liposome preparation.

6. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touitou (5,716,638) by itself or in combination Cauwenbergh (5,476,853) OR Touitou

(5,716,638) by itself or in combination Cauwenbergh (5,476,853) in further combination with Delrieu (5,962,015) as set forth above, further in view of WO 01/17523 of record or vice versa: that is, WO 01/17523 in view of Touitou by itself or in combination with either Cauwenbergh or Cauwenbergh and Delrieu.

WO teaches liposomal skin compositions containing triterpenoid, ursolic acid (page 1, lines 20-31). The method of preparation involves dissolving ursolic acid, phosphatidylcholine in ethanol and then adding this mixture to water (Example 1). WO however, does not teach the inclusion of propylene glycol or prepare the liposomes by the addition of TEA.

The use of ursolic acid as the terpene in the generic teachings of Touitou or in the teachings of Touitou, Cauwenbergh and Delrieu with a reasonable expectation of success since WO teaches that ursolic acid can be encapsulated in liposomes for skin treatment. Alternately, the use of the method of Touitou in WO would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art since according to Touitou the ethasomes prepared by the method taught are softer and have enhanced skin permeability for various compounds (col. 2, lines 3-24).

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are not found to be persuasive. Applicant argues that the object of the present invention is to provide submicron liposomes containing triterpenoid at a high concentration while using a non-toxic solvent without intensive mechanical treatment. In order to incorporate the triterpenoid at a high concentration uniformly into a liposome, the present invention employs a triterpenoids having acid group, and by adding a base, the triterpenoid is

transformed into its salt having surface activity. Applicant further argues that the transformed triterpenoid salt is a surfactant of a high HLB, and it forms a mixed micelle system when mixed with a low HLB lipid. The above-obtained mixed micelle system maintains its pH in a range of 10-11. By adding an acid to decrease its pH to 5-8, the triterpenoid salt reverts back to its original form having an acid group, and thereby loses its surface activity, thereby changing the mixed micelle system into a liposome. During the transformation, the triterpenoid is loaded into the liposome at a high concentration. (See page 2, third full paragraph of specification of the present invention). Further according to applicant, None of the cited documents disclose such use of an acid and a base for transformation into a mixed micelle system or liposome as in the present invention and thus, the present invention is considered to be non-obvious over the teachings of the cited documents.

These arguments are not persuasive. First of all, applicant only describes the essence of the invention and does not specifically argue how the prior art process is different from instant invention as presented in the claims. With regard to the initial alkaline pH values and decrease of those values to lower range, the examiner points out that the prior art of Touitou basically teaches initial addition of the base and changing the pH to appropriate values since the application is topical would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to change the pH based on the teachings of the secondary reference. The motivation to change need not be the same as applicant's.

Application/Control Number: 10/676,260 Page 7

Art Unit: 1615

7. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gollamudi S. Kishore, Ph.D whose telephone number is (571) 272-0598. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 AM- 4 PM, alternate Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Woodward Michael can be reached on (571) 272-8373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Gollamudi S Kishore, Ph.D Primary Examiner Art Unit 1615

GSK